COPY

		ENDOUGED
		2017 NOT 17 ACHT: 57
1 2 3 4 5	Cary Kletter (SBN 210230) KLETTER LAW 1900 S. Norfolk Street, Suite 350 San Mateo, Culifornia 94403 415.434.3400 Attorney for PLAINTIFF, ESMERALDA SOTO	3. Alvarez
7	IN AND FOR THE COU	INTY OF SANTA CLARA
8	ESMERALDA SOTO.	Case No. 17 C v 31938
10	PLAINTIFF,	COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND
11	V.	Failure to Pay Wages (FLSA);
12		2. Failure to Pay Wages (CA Labor
13	CHIPOTLE SERVICES, LLC; and DOES 1 - 20, inclusive.	Code); 3. Liquidated Damages: 4. Failure to Provide Meal Periods:
.14	DEFENDANTS.	5. Waiting Time Penalties:6. Violation of CA Labor Code §§ 204
16	:	and 210;Failure to Provide Accurate Wage
17		Statements; 8. Disability Discrimination;
18		 Failure to Accommodate: Failure to Engage in the Interactive
19		Process;
20		Labor Code Retaliation – Labor Cod
21		§ 98.6; 13. Wrongful Termination in Violation o
22		Public Policy; and 14. Unlawful, Unfair and Fraudulent
23		Business Practices:
24		
25 26		
27		•
28		
and the second s	COMPLAINT A	SD JURY DEMAND

3

5

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

2223

24

25 26

27

28

PLAINTIFF alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This is an action brought by PLAINTIFF ESMERALDA SOTO ("PLAINTIFF" or SOTO") against the DEFENDANTS CHIPOTLE SERVICES, LLC ("CHIPOTLE"); and DOES 1 through 20 (collectively, "DEFENDANTS"), inclusive, in connection with claims arising out of PLAINTIFF's employment with the DEFENDANTS.
- 2. This is an action for damages due to (1) Failure to Pay Wages (FLSA); (2) Failure to Pay Wages (CA Labor Code); (3) Liquidated Damages; (4) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (5) Waiting Time Penalties; (6) Violation of CA Labor Code §§ 204 and 210; (7) Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements; (8) Disability Discrimination; (9) Failure to Accommodate; (10) Failure to Engage in the Interactive Process; (11) FEHA Retaliation; (12) Labor Code Retaliation Labor Code § 98.6; (13) Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy; and (14) Unlawful, Unfair and Fraudulent Business Practices.

THE PARTIES

- 3. PLAINTIFF is an individual who, at all relevant times, was and is a resident of the State of California, County of San Mateo.
- 4. CHIPOTLE is, upon information and belief, a corporation doing business and operating in the State of California, County of Santa Clara.
- 5. PLAINTIFF is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the DEFENDANTS sued herein as DOES 1 through 20 therefore sues them by such fictitious names. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said DEFENDANTS are in some manner legally responsible for the activities and damages alleged herein. PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
- 6. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned each of the DEFENDANTS was acting as the partner, agent, servant, and employee of each of the remaining DEFENDANTS, and in doing the things alleged herein was acting within the course and scope of such agency and with the knowledge of the remaining DEFENDANTS.
- 7. DEFENDANTS operated as an integrated enterprise, with shared resources, and agency in fact for the others.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- Jurisdiction and venue are proper because PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS in the County of Santa Clara, California.
- 9. In response to CHIPOTLE's unlawful conduct, PLAINTIFF has filed a timely Complaint against CHIPOTLE with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEII") on June 29, 2017.
- 10. On June 29, 2017, the DFEH issued a Right-To-Sue Notice under California Government Code Section 12965(b), permitting PLAINTIFF to file a civil action against CHIPOTLE under the provisions of FEHA.
- 11. On June 29, 2017, CHIPOTLE was served with the DFEH Complaint and Right-to-Sue Notice via certified mail.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 12. PLAINTIFF started working at CHIPOTLE in Palo Alto, California on June 28, 2013 as a crew member at \$13.00 per hour.
- 13. On or around January 27, 2016, PLAINTIFF received a merit based promotion to "Kitchen Manager" and received a pay increase to \$14.00 per hour.
- 14. On or around July 28, 2016, Plaintiff was again promoted because of her excellent work. She was promoted to "Service Manager" and received a pay increase to \$15.00 per hour.
- 15. On or around March 22, 2017, PLAINTIFF received an additional merit based pay increase to \$16.00 per hour.
- 16. After PLAINTIFF was promoted to Service Manager, she was no longer provided with opportunities to take any meal breaks during her shifts.
- 17. Due to CHIPOTLE's insufficient staffing during PLAINTIFF's shifts, PLAINTIFF was forced to work approximately 45 minutes off-the-clock work, after she punched out for the day, about two times per week.
 - 18. PLAINTIFF was not paid for any of her known off-the-clock work.
- 19. PLAINTIFF was also required to punch out for meal breaks as if she had been provided with them even though she was never afforded such breaks.
- 20. PLAINTIFF was required to punch out for breaks that she did not receive because CHIPOTLE's time-keeping system would otherwise not allow her to clock out at the end of her shifts.

27

28

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

2	I. PLAINTIFF	's supervisors	at CHIPO	TLE were	all wel	ll-aware	that P	LAINTIFF	was no
provid	ed with meal l	breaks.							

- 22. PLAINTIFF's supervisors at CHIPOTLE required her to stay on the premises at all times to complete tasks due to insufficient staffing.
- 23. PLAINTIFF was not paid for the off-the-clock work she performed for the times she clocked out for meal breaks but did not receive such breaks.
- 24. During PLAINTIFF's employment, she complained to her supervisors several times regarding her inability to take breaks due to the lack of staffing.
- 25. DEFENDANTS' management personnel constantly told PLAINTIFF that it was her responsibility to make sure all tasks were completed.
 - 26. PLAINTIFF was often told she needed to get the job done and sacrifice her own breaks.
- 27. PLAINTIFF informed DEFENDANTS that she suffers from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder ("PTSD") and that the lack of breaks and insufficient staffing was exacerbating her conditions and causing her overwhelming stress.
- 28. PLAINTIFF' continuously complained to her manager, Emma LeSui about not receiving breaks.
- 29. PLAINTIFF complained to DEFENDANTS' management team that the stress from not having breaks was worsening her disability.
- 30. No action was taken in response to PLAINTIFF's complaints and the understaffing issue persisted until her constructive termination on May 24, 2017.
- 31. As a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to take any action whatsoever in response to PLAINTIFF's complaints, PLAINTIFF was forced to quit after four years of employment, with no job prospect because her health and welfare was in jeopardy.
- 32. PLAINTIFF gave her supervisor two weeks' notice of her resignation on or around May 19, 2017.
- 33. On May 21, 2017, PLAINTIFF called DEFENDANTS to inform them that her daughter had a fever and she would not be able to work on Monday.
- 34. PLAINTIFF called another employee and that employee was able to cover her shift on Monday, May 22, 2017.
- 35. PLAINTIFF's employment with CHIPOTLE ended on May 26, 2017 when DEFENDANTS abruptly terminated her employment after she took time-off work to care for

28

her very sick daughter.

- 36. PLAINTIFF is owed wages for her accrued sick leave.
- 37. PLAINTIFF did not receive accurate wage statements during her employment with CHIPOTLE.
- 38. PLAINTIFF has suffered significant emotional distress as a result of DEFENDANTS' conduct.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Wages (FLSA) 29 USC 207 (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 39. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.
- 40. The FLSA provides that employees must be paid for all hours worked in a workweek.
- 41. The FLSA provides that an employee must receive overtime payment for hours worked in excess of 40 hours in a workweek at a rate not less than time and one-half (1½) the regular rate of pay.
- 42. On many occasions throughout PLAINTIFF's employment, DEFENDANTS engaged, suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF to work in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.
- 43. During PLAINTIFF's employment, PLAINTIFF worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a week without receiving minimum overtime compensation.
- 44. During PLAINTIFF's employment, PLAINTIFF was required to work off-the-clock and was not paid any wages for those hours worked.
- 45. PLAINTIFF worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a week without receiving minimum overtime compensation during the statutory time period.
- 46. DEFENDANTS willfully failed to pay PLAINTIFF for all hours worked and failed to pay PLAINTIFF's overtime premium for every hour of overtime that they engaged, suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF to work.
 - 47. DEFENDANTS intentionally failed to comply with the requirements of the FLSA.
- 48. As a legal result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has suffered harm and are is entitled to recover the unpaid hourly "straight" wages and overtime compensation, including interest thereon, costs of suit and reasonable attorneys' fees, all in an amount to be determined at trial.

7 8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Wages (California Labor Code) (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 49. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.
- 50. The California Labor Code ("Labor Code") including, but not limited to, § 510(a) provides that work in excess of 8 hours in a day, or 40 hours in a week, must be compensated at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.
- 51. IWC Wage Order 4 and/or Title 8 of Cal. Code of Regulations § 11010 et seq. also provide that work in excess of 8 hours in a day, or 40 hours in a week, must be compensated at not less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.
- 52. PLAINTIFF sometimes worked 8 hours or more per shift during her employment with DEFENDANTS.
- 53. PLAINTIFF typically worked more than 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week during the statutory time period without being properly compensated for all hours worked.
- 54. PLAINTIFF was not paid wages for all hours she worked, and she regularly worked off the clock as instructed by management.
- 55. DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF overtime premium wages for all overtime hours worked.
- 56. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, PLAINTIFF is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of eight hours a day.
- 57. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS conduct, PLAINTIFF has suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 58. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF is also entitled to attorneys' fees under Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 1194, in addition to interest, expenses and costs of suit.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Liquidated Damages Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2 and FLSA (Against all DEFENDANTS)

59. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.

- 60. At times, Plaintiff was not even paid minimum wage for her hours worked.
- 61. PLAINTIFF brings an action under CA Labor Code § 1194(a) and the FLSA to recover liquidated damages because DEFENDANTS did not pay PLAINTIFF's minimum overtime wages set by statute or as ordered by California Industrial Welfare Commission under IWC Wage Order 4-2001, 8 Cal. Code of Regulations § 11040, and 29 U.S.C. 216(b).
- 62. PLAINTIFF is entitled to liquidated damages under the California Labor Code and the FLSA.
- 63. By reason of the conduct alleged hereinabove, PLAINTIFF is entitled to liquidated damages pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194.2 and the FLSA, in an amount according to proof.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Meal Periods in Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Orders (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 64. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.
- 65. At all times relevant herein, Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and the applicable wage IWC orders, including IWC Wage Order 4-2001 (Cal. Code Reg., tit. 8, § 11010, subds. 11(A) and 12(A)), have required DEFENDANTS to provide PLAINTIFF meal and rest periods.
- 66. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC wage orders, including IWC Wage Order 4-2001 (Cal. Code Reg., tit. 8, § 11010, subds. 11(A) and 12(A)), prohibit employers from employing an employee for more than five hours without providing an opportunity for a meal period of less than 30 minutes, unless the employee works less than six hours.
- 67. Unless an employee is relieved of all duty during the 30-minute meal period, the employee is considered "on duty" and the meal and rest periods are counted as time worked, under the applicable wage orders.
- 68. Under Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the IWC wage orders, an employer who fails to provide a required meal period must, as compensation, pay the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period was not provided.
- 69. During the statutory time period, PLAINTIFF regularly worked more than five (5) hours per day, but was not provided with an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break where she was

relieved of all her job duties.

- 70. DEFENDANTS had a policy and practice of not providing PLAINTIFF with uninterrupted meal breaks.
- 71. The aforementioned policies and practices are in violation of law, in that DEFENDANTS' policies and practices have denied PLAINTIFF the meal breaks to which she was legally entitled.
- 72. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF has suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 73. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF is also entitled to attorneys' fees under Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 1194, in addition to interest, expenses and costs of suit.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Waiting Time Penalties Labor Code §§ 201 and 203 (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 74. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.
- 75. Labor Code § 201(a) requires an employer who discharges an employee to pay compensation due and owing to the employee immediately upon discharge.
- 76. PLAINTIFF was not paid full compensation for all hours worked within the statutory timeframe—i.e., PLAINTIFF has not been paid all regular wages and overtime wages due to her, the premiums due to her for the meal breaks and rest periods that she was not provided, and her accrued vacation pay.
- 77. DEFENDANTS have willfully failed and refused to make timely payment of wages to PLAINTIFF.
- 78. Labor Code § 201(a) requires an employer who discharges an employee to pay compensation due and owing to the employee immediately upon discharge.
- 79. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required under Labor Code § 201, then the employer is liable for waiting time pay in the form of continued compensation for up to thirty (30) work days.
 - 80. PLAINTIFF is entitled to unpaid compensation for all hours worked at the legally

mandated rates, but for which she has not yet been paid.

- 81. PLAINTIFF has not yet been fully compensated for the hours she worked.
- 82. DEFENDANTS have willfully failed and refused to make timely payment of wages to PLAINTIFF.
- 83. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, DEFENDANTS are liable to PLAINTIFF for up to thirty (30) days of waiting time pay pursuant to Labor Code § 203.
- 84. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF is also entitled to attorneys' fees under Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 1194, in addition to interest, expenses and costs of suit.
- 85. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF has suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 86. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations.
- 87. All wages due to any employee are due and payable twice during each month and all overtime wages must be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period pursuant to Labor Code § 204.
- 88. DEFENDANTS did not pay PLAINTIFF all of the wages, including overtime wages, to which she was owed for each pay period throughout her employment.
- 89. DEFENDANTS did not pay PLAINTIFF all of the wages to which she was owed within the applicable time periods set forth in Labor Code § 204.
- 90. DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF overtime wages to which she was entitled and failed to make each and every payment on time to PLAINTIFF.
- 91. Labor Code § 210 provides, without limitation, that in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided by the Labor Code, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5 of the Labor Code, shall be subject to a civil penalty.
 - 92. DEFENDANTS failed to pay wages to PLAINTIFF, as provided in sections 201.3, 204,

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

28

204b, 201.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5 and 1197.5 of the Labor Code.

93. Labor Code § 210 provides for penalties for failure to pay wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 204 as one-hundred dollars (\$100) for any initial violation and two-hundred dollars (\$200) for each subsequent violation, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount withheld.

94. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF is entitled to attorneys' fees, in addition to interest, expenses and costs of suit.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide an Accurate Wage Statement in Violation of Labor Code § 226(a) and 226(e) (Against all DEFENDANTS)

95. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.

96. Labor Code § 226(a) and/or IWC Wage Orders (See 8 Cal. Code of Regs., §11040(8)) provide that every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, provide each employee with a written, accurate statement showing, inter alia, the gross wages earned, the total hours worked by the employee, and the applicable hourly rate in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours earned at each hourly rate.

97. The Labor Code § 226(e) provides:

An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which the violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and attorneys' fees.

- 98. During the statutory time period, DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to provide accurate wage statements to PLAINTIFF in that the wage statements that DEFENDANTS provided to PLAINTIFF do not accurately reflect the actual hours worked and the wages earned.
 - 99. Wage statements to PLAINTIFF during the statutory time period were inaccurate.
- 100. DEFENDANTS are liable to PLAINTIFF for the amounts described above, in addition to the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §226.3.
 - 101. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF is entitled

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

- 10 -

25

26

27

28

to attorneys' fees under Labor Code § 226(e), in addition to interest, expenses and costs of suit.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Disability Discrimination Cal. Gov. Code § 12940 et seq. (Against All DEFENDANTS)

- 102. PLAINTIFF incorporates all of the previous allegations herein.
- 103. DEFENDANTS, through their agents and employees, engaged in a pattern and practice of unlawful discrimination in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") in connection with the terms and conditions of PLAINTIFF's employment.
 - 104. PLAINTIFF was discriminated against due to her disabilities.
- 105. PLAINTIFF suffered adverse employment action by, *inter alia*, being denied appropriate accommodation that she requested.
- 106. DEFENDANTS' conduct adversely affected the terms and conditions of PLAINTIFF's employment and thereby constituted adverse employment actions.
- 107. DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge of the discriminatory conduct described and alleged herein, and condoned, ratified and/or participated in the discrimination.
 - 108. As a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to protect PLAINTFF from discrimination, PLAINTFF suffered significant emotional distress.
- 109. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that in addition to the practices enumerated above, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, engaged in other discriminatory practices against PLAINTIFF, which are not yet fully known. At such time as said discriminatory practices become known to PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF will seek leave of court to amend this complaint in those regards.
- 110. DEFENDANTS' acts were malicious, oppressive or fraudulent with intent to vex, injure, annoy, humiliate and embarrass PLAINTIFF, and in conscious disregard of the rights or safety of PLAINTIFF, other employees of DEFENDANTS, and the public in furtherance of DEFENDANTS' ratification of the wrongful conduct of the managers of DEFENDANTS. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF is entitled to recover punitive damages from DEFENDANTS.
 - 111. By reason of the conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them as alleged herein,

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

EXHIBIT A

PLAINTIFF has necessarily retained attorneys to prosecute the within action. PLAINTIFF is therefore entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation expenses, including expert witness fees and costs, incurred in bringing the within action. As a result of DEFENDANTS' and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF sustained economic damages to be proven at trial. As a further result of DEFENDANTS' and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF suffered emotional distress; resulting in damages to be proven at trial.

112. The above discriminatory conduct violates FEHA, Government Code §§ 12940 and 12941 and California Public Policy and entitles PLAINTIFF to all categories of damages, including exemplary or punitive damages.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Accommodate – FEHA Cal. Gov. Code § 12940 et seq. (Against All DEFENDANTS)

- 113. PLAINTIFF incorporates all of the previous allegations herein.
- 114. The actions and conduct of the DEFENDANTS, or some of them, violated FEHA in that DEFENDANTS, or some of them, failed to provide PLAINTIFF with reasonable accommodations for her disabilities.
- 115. The public policy of the State of California set forth within Cal. Gov. Code §12940 et seq. supports employment of persons with disabilities. It is the statutory obligation of the employer to engage in an interactive process in an attempt to make a reasonable accommodation for the disability of an employee, including but not limited to, job restructuring.
- 116. DEFENDANTS have and had an ongoing duty to engage in the interactive process to determine an effective and reasonable accommodation for PLAINTIFF, but DEFENDANTS completely failed to do so.
- 117. In violation of FEHA, DEFENDANTS, or some of them, failed to provide PLAINTIFF with reasonable accommodations for her medical disability and failed to engage in an ongoing interactive process.
- 118. PLAINTIFF is and was able to perform the essential functions of her position with reasonable accommodation, as confirmed by her doctor.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

- 12 -

119. PLAINTIFF's meal periods could have been accommodated by DEFENDA.
--

- 120. DEFENDANTS failed to meet their obligations under FEHA by failing to reassign PLAINITFF to a vacant, equivalent position or accommodating her in her position.
- 121. As a proximate cause of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages and general damages in the form of pain and suffering, physical injury, emotional distress, humiliation embarrassment and attorneys' fees and costs in an amount according to proof.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Engage in the Interactive Process - FEHA Cal. Gov. Code § 12940 et seq. (Against All DEFENDANTS)

- 122. PLAINTIFF incorporates all of the previous allegations herein.
- 123. DEFENDANTS were required to engage in a timely, ongoing, good faith interactive process to attempt to accommodate PLAINTIFF.
- 124. DEFENDANTS' obligation to engage in the interactive process continues when the employee asks for a different accommodation, or when the employer is aware that the initial accommodation is failing.
- 125. DEFENDANTS failed to meet their obligations of engaging in the interactive process with PLAINTIFF.
- 126. DEFENDANTS completely failed to meet their obligations to reasonably accommodate as they required PLAINTIFF to work for long periods of time without a rest break. PLAINTIFF continually requested accommodations, but her requests were ignored and DEFENDANTS did not make any attempt to find an alternate accommodation.
- 127. PLAINTIFF is and was able to perform the essential functions of her position with reasonable accommodation.
- 128. DEFENDANTS have and had an ongoing duty to engage in the interactive process to determine an effective and reasonable accommodation for PLAINTIFF, but DEFENDANTS completely failed to do so.
- 129. At all relevant times, DEFENDANTS had actual and constructive knowledge of the failure to engage in the interactive process described and alleged herein, and condoned, ratified and/or participated in the discrimination.

130. DEFENDANTS' acts were malicious, oppressive or fraudulent with intent to vex, injure, annoy, humiliate and embarrass PLAINTIFF or cajole her to quit, and in conscious disregard of the rights or safety of PLAINTIFF, other employees of DEFENDANTS, and the public and in furtherance of DEFENDANTS' ratification of the wrongful conduct of the managers of DEFENDANTS. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF is entitled to recover punitive damages from DEFENDANTS.

131. By reason of the conduct of DEFENDANTS and each of them as alleged herein, PLAINTIFF has necessarily retained attorneys to prosecute the within action. PLAINTIFF is therefore entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation expenses, including expert witness fees and costs, incurred in bringing the within action. As a result of DEFENDANTS' and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF sustained economic damages to be proven at trial. As a further result of DEFENDANTS' and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF suffered emotional distress; resulting in damages to be proven at trial.

132. The above discriminatory conduct violates FEHA, Government Code §§ 12940 and 12941 and California Public Policy and entitles Plaintiff to all categories of damages, including exemplary and/or punitive damages.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FEHA Retaliation – Cal. Gov. Code § 12945.1 et seq. (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 133. PLAINTIFF incorporates all of the previous allegations herein.
- 134. PLAINTIFF's unlawful termination constitutes retaliation in violation of FEHA.
- 135. Demoting PLAINTIFF upon his return from disability leave constituted retaliation in violation of FEHA.
- 136. Terminating PLAINTIFF while on disability leave after he informed DEFENDANT'S of his expected date of return constituted retaliation in violating FEHA.
- 137. By reason of the conduct of DEFENDANTS and each of them as alleged herein, PLAINTIFF has necessarily retained attorneys to prosecute the within action. PLAINTIFF is therefore entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation expenses, including expert witness fees and costs, incurred in bringing the within action. As a result of DEFENDANTS and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF sustained economic damages to be proven at trial. As a further

result of DEFENDANTS and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF suffered emotional distress resulting in damages to be proven at trial.

138. The conduct of DEFENDANTS and/or their agents/employees as described herein was malicious, and/or oppressive, and done with a willful and conscious disregard for PLAINTIFF's rights and for the deleterious consequences of DEFENDANTS' actions. DEFENANTS and/or their agents/employees or supervisors authorized, condoned and ratified the unlawful conduct remaining DEFENDANTS. Consequently, PLAINTIFF is entitled to punitive damages against DEFENDANTS.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Labor Code Retaliation in Violation of Labor Code §98.6 (Against All DEFENDANTS)

- 139. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.
- 140. In violation of Labor Code § 98.6, DEFENDANTS retaliated against PLAINTIFF for having opposed, resisted, and complained of the acts alleged herein.
- 141. Within a short time after PLAINTIFF complained of DEFENDANTS violations of her rights under the Labor Code regarding her missed breaks and working off-the-clock due to insufficient staffing by DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF was subjected to retaliatory treatment including constructive termination and having her position abruptly terminated.
- 142. By reason of the conduct of DEFENDANTS and each of them as alleged herein, PLAINTIFF has necessarily retained attorneys to prosecute the within action. PLAINTIFF is therefore entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and litigation expenses, including expert witness fees and costs, incurred in bringing the within action.
- 143. As a result of DEFENDANTS and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF sustained economic damages to be proven at trial. As a further result of DEFENDANTS' and each of their actions, PLAINTIFF suffered emotional distress; resulting in damages to be proven at trial.
- 144. The conduct of DEFENDANTS and/or their agents/employees as described herein was malicious, and/or oppressive, and done with a willful and conscious disregard for PLAINTIFF's rights and for the deleterious consequences of DEFENDANTS' actions. DEFENDANTS and/or their agents/employees or supervisors authorized, condoned and

ratified the unlawful conduct of the remaining DEFENDANTS. Consequently, PLAINTIFF is entitled to punitive damages against DEFENDANTS.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 145. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.
- 146. PLAINTIFF was constructively terminated by DEFENDANTS because the working conditions at CHIPOTLE were intolerable because of the consistent lack of breaks, insufficient staffing and complete disregard for PLAINTIFF's disability ("PTSD").
- 147. Complaints and/or information about the lack of breaks and insufficient staffing were made to PLAINTIFF's managers and supervisors but no action was taken in response. DEFENDANTS completely ignored PLAINTIFF's concerns.
- 148. DEFENDANTS intentionally created or knowingly permitted working conditions so intolerable that a reasonable person in PLAINTIFF's position would be compelled to resign. As a result, PLAINTIFF had to resign because her health, safety and well-being were in jeopardy.
- 149. PLAINTIFF resigned in reasonable response to DEFENDANTS' failure to provide breaks and reasonable accommodation to which she was entitled.
- 150. The termination by DEFENDANTS violates the Public Policy of the State of California as put forward in the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Constitution, the California Labor Code, and other statutes and provisions.
- 151. As a result of said conduct, PLAINTIFF suffered general and exemplary damages as well as having to incur attorneys' fees to prosecute said action.
- 152. DEFENDANTS, and each of them, did acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, with the wrongful intent to injure PLAINTIFF, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. The acts complained of were known to, authorized and ratified by DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF is therefore entitled to recover punitive damages from DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

- 16 -

25

26

27

28

FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful, Unfair and Fraudulent Business Practices In Violation of B&P Code §§ 17200 and 17203, et seq. (Against all DEFENDANTS)

- 153. PLAINTIFF re-alleges all of the previous allegations herein.
- 154. The California Business & Professions Code ("B&P Code") § 17200 et seq. prohibits unfair competition in the form of any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.
- 155. B&P Code § 17202 provides: "Notwithstanding Section 2289 of the Civil Code, specific or preventative relief may be granted to enforce a penalty, forfeiture, or penal law in case of unfair competition."
- 156. B&P Code § 17203 provides that the Court may restore to any person in interest any money or property which may have been acquired by means of such unfair competition.
- 157. B&P Code § 17203 also provides that any person who meets the standing requirements of Section 17204 and complies with CCP Section 382 may pursue representative claims for relief on behalf of others.
- 158. B&P Code § 17204 allows "any person who has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of such unfair competition" to prosecute a civil action for violation of the Unfair Business Practices Act.
- 159. Labor Code § 90.5(a) states that it is the public policy of California to vigorously enforce minimum labor standards in order to ensure PLAINTIFF is not required to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect employers who comply with the law from those who attempt to gain competitive advantage at the expense of its workers by failing to comply with the minimum standards law.
- 160. Pursuant to B&P § 17202, PLAINTIFF is entitled to enforce all applicable provisions of the Labor Code.
- 161. Beginning at an exact date unknown to PLAINTIFF, but at least since the date four years prior to the filing of this suit, DEFENDANTS have committed acts of unfair competition as defined by the Unfair Business Practices Act, by engaging in the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent practices and acts described in this Complaint, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Violations of the FLSA;
 - b. Violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage Order 4 pertaining to meal and rest periods;

- c. Violations of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194, and IWC Wage Order 4 pertaining to overtime compensation;
- d. Violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 203, 204, 210 and 2698(f)(2), pertaining to unpaid wages; and
- e. Violations of Labor Code § 226, pertaining to accurate statements of wages.
- 162. By violating these statutes and regulations, the acts of DEFENDANTS constitute unfair and unlawful business practices under B&P § 17200 et seq.
- 163. The violations of these laws and regulations, as well as of fundamental California public policies protecting workers, serve as unlawful predicate acts and practices for purposes of B&P Code §§ 17200 and 17203, et seq.
- 164. The acts and practices described above constitute unfair, unlawful and fraudulent business practices, and unfair competition, within the meaning of B&P Code §§ 17200 and 17203, et seq. DEFENDANTS' violation of the law and regulations described above constitutes a business practice because it was done repeatedly over a significant period of time and in a systematic manner to the detriment of PLAINTIFF. Among other things, DEFENDANTS' acts and practices have forced PLAINTIFF to work more than eight (8) hours in a day and 40 hours in a week without receiving premium (overtime) pay and the meal and rest periods to which she was entitled by law and which are important to employee safety. The acts and practices described above have allowed DEFENDANTS to gain an unfair competitive advantage over law-abiding employers and competitors.
- 165. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and practices described herein, PLAINTIFF has been denied compensation, in an amount to be proven at trial. PLAINTIFF has accordingly suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of DEFENDANTS' unfair, unlawful and fraudulent business practices, and unfair competition.
- 166. PLAINTIFF is entitled to restitution pursuant to B&P Code § 17203 for all wages and other compensation unlawfully withheld from PLAINTIFF during the four-year period prior to the filing of the complaint.
- 167. Injunctive relief is necessary and appropriate to prevent DEFENDANTS from repeating their unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts and practices described herein.
- 168. Pursuant to § 17203 and/or any other applicable law, PLAINTIFF seeks an order preventing DEFENDANTS from engaging in unlawful, unfair and fraudulent conduct, and

2

preventing DEFENDANTS from profiting and benefiting from illegal and wrongful acts.

169. PLAINTIFF's success in this action will enforce important rights affecting the public interest. Therefore, PLAINTIFF sues on behalf of the general public, as well as herself.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as is further set forth below.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 1. For a declaratory judgment that DEFENDANTS have violated the Federal Labor Standards Act, California Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Labor Code and public policy, as alleged herein;
- For a declaratory judgment that DEFENDANTS have violated B&P Code §§ 17200 and 17203, et seq., as a result of the aforementioned violations of the California Labor Code and public policy protecting workers;
- 3. For a permanent and mandatory injunction prohibiting DEFENDANTS, their officers, agents, employees, affiliated companies, and all those working in concert with them, from committing future violations of the laws and public policies described herein;
 - 4. For an award of restitution;
- 5. For an order imposing all statutory and/or civil penalties provided by law, including but not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 201-204, 210, 211, and 226(e) together with interest on these amounts;
- For an order awarding PLAINTIFF compensatory damages, including but not limited to wages, earnings, and other compensation, according to proof, and interest on these amounts;
 - 7. For emotional distress damages according to proof;
 - 8. For punitive damages according to proof;
 - 9. For an order that DEFENDANTS must disgorge ill-gotten gains;
- 10. For award of reasonable attorneys' fees, as provided by Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 1194 and/or other applicable law;

1	00.00000000000000000000000000000000000	RY TRIAL DEMANDED
2		by jury on each cause of action for which a trial by jury is
3	proper.	
4	Dated: November 16, 2017	KLETTER LAW
5		
- 6-		By: Ay Cary Kletter
7		
8		Attorney for PLAINTIFF ESMERALDA SOTO
9		
10		
11		
12		•
13		
14		
15 16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

- 21 -

12-17-17-140

COPY

			ENDÜG	SUM-10
(SUMMONS CITACION JUDICIAL)	-	FOR COURT USE GHLY (SELD)PARA USO DE LA CO	
NOTICE TO DEFENDANT (AVISO AL DEMANDADO		s. LL/) of waste		
CHIPOTLE SERVICES	. LLC.; and DOES 1 THRO	UGH 20, inclusive,	Alver) 07
YOU ARÉ BEING SUED B (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO			S. Alvar	62
ESMERALDA SOTO,				
NOTICE! You have been sued."	The coun may decide against you with	oul your being heard unless yo	urespond within 30 days. Read it	ve information
referral service. If you cannot affilities a nonprofit groups at the Callinson countrito de gowiselibelp), coste on any settlement la arbitra (AVISO) Lo han demandado. Si continuación: Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDAI corte y hacer que se entregue un en formato legal correcto sí dese Puede encontrar estos formulanto ubibidade a de leyes de su condad que le de un formulario de exone podrá qualar su suedo, dirierro y la contra de sus suedos, dirierro y la contra qualar su suedo, dirierro y la contra	menis. You may want to call an attorne oris an attorner, you may be eligible to illomia Legal Services Web site (www. or by contacting your local court or con attorners in a critical court or con responde dentro de 30 dlas. Is con RIO después de que le entreguen esta la capia el demandante. Una carta o u a que procesen su caso en la corte. Sis de la conte y más información en el o o en la corte que le quede más cerci tión de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta tión de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta	i free legal services from a non lawhelpcaidromia.org), the Calif lawhelpcaidromia org), the Calif in case. The court's lien must be the pueble decidir en su contra si citación y papeles legales para no llamada telefónica no lo pro- s posible que heye un formular Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de s. Si no pueble pagar la curda de	profil legal services program. You ontil ocurts Online Sell-Help Cer- le court has a statutory filen for wa- e paid before the court will disma- in escucher su versign. Lea la into- a presentar una respuesta por ex- tegen. Su raspuesta por escrito te- tio que usted pueda usar pará su r de Calidoma purva sucorte ca-go le presentación, pida al secretario	can locate nter rved fees and s the case ormacion e orito en esta ene que estar respuesta vi) en la de la corte
remisión a abogados. Si no pued programa de servicios legales sir (varv.lav/telpcalifornia org), en e colegio de apogados locales. AV	s recomendable que llame à un abogà le pagar a un abogado es posible que l'fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos d'Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de C ISO. Por ley la corte tiene derecho a r	cumpta con los requisitos para s grupos sin fines de lucro en e aldornia, (www.sucone.ca.gov) eclarnar las cuotas y los costo:	i obtener servicios legales gretuito I sitio web de California Legal Ser o poniendose en contacto con la la exentos por imponer un gravarna	os de un vices. corte o el en sobre
remisón a abogados. Sí no pued programa de servicios tegales sir invivalente la california org. en e colegio de abogados locales. AV. cualquer recuperación de 210,00 pagar al gravaman de la corte un the name and address of the c	s recomendable que flame à um aboga le commendable que flame a um aboga de se posible que in fines de fucro. Puede encontrar estos d'Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de CiSO. Por ley la corte tiena derecho a rió o mas de valor recibida mediante un tes de que la corte pueda desecha reficies de que la corte pueda desechar el court is.	cumpta con los requisitos para s grupos sin fines de lucro en e shlornia, (www.sucone.ca gov) eclamar las cuotas y los costot n acuerdo o una concesión de l caso	i oblener servicios legales gratudo I sido web de California Legal Ser o poniendose en contacto con la la a exentos por imponer un gravant aroltraje en un caso de derecho di	os de un vices, corte o ei en sobre ivil. Tiene que
remision a abogados. Si no pued programa de servicios tegales si invivore lipado programa de servicios tegales si invivore lipado participado participado de 2000 de 2000 pagar at gravamen de la cone un the name and address of the cell inombre y dirección de la co. Superior Court of Califor	s recomendable que flame à un aboga le pagar a un abogado es posible que in fines de fucro. Puede encontrar estos di Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de Cu- sor de la corte tiene derecho a in 100 ó más de valor recibida mediante un ties de que la corte pueda desechar el court is inte es):	cumpta con los requisitos para s grupos sin fines de lucro en e shlornia, (www.sucone.ca gov) eclamar las cuotas y los costot n acuerdo o una concesión de l caso	i obtener servicios legales gretuito I sitio web de California Legal Ser o poniendose en contacto con la la exentos por imponer un gravarna	os de un vices, corte o ei en sobre ivil. Tiene que
remision a abogados. Si no pued programa de servicios legales si invivale lucute liquidos invivale lucute liquidos invivale lucute liquidos invivales de la consecución de algonos de la consecución de la consecu	s recomendable que flame à un aboga le pagar a un aboga le pagar a un abogado es posible que la fines de fucro. Puede encontrar estos d'Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de C. ISO. Por ley la corte tiene derecho a in 20 ó más de valor recibida mediante un tes de que la corte pueda desechar el court is mate es): mia, County of Santa Clara iosc, CA 95113 none number of plaintiffs attorney, imero de teléfono del abogado del A-1900 S. Norfolk Street, St. NOV 1 7 2017	cumple con los requisitos para gripos sin fines de lucro en e siliorna, (www. suconea gov) eclamar las cuotes y los costos acuerdo o una concesión de la caso or plaintiff without an attorr demandante, o del demante e. 350, San Mateo, CA Clerk, by (Secretairo)	a piterier servicios legales graturo i sitio web de California Legal Sar o poniendose en contacto con la aventos por imponer un gravaria enotraje en un caso de derecho di secundo de la contacto de la c	ns de ur. vices. corte o el en sobre en sobre virt Trene que
remision a abogados. Si no pued programa de servicios legales si invivale lucute liquides si invivale lucute liquides si invivale lucute liquides. AVI cualquer recuperación de 110.00 pagar el gravamen de la corte un fine name and address of the del frombre y dirección de la costa programa. Superior Court of Califor 191 N. First Street. San Jiche name, address, and telepre in nombre, la dirección y el nú Cary Kletter-Kletter Lavidat.	s recomendable que flame à un aboga le pagar a un aboga le contro de Ayuda de las Cortes de C. ISO. Por ley la corte tiene derecho a in 20 ó más de valor recibida mediante un tes de que la corte pueda desechar el court is inte es): mia, County of Santa Clara (iosc, CA 95113) none number of plaintiffs altorney, imero de teléfono del abogado del a 1900 S. Norfolk Street, Str. NOV 1 7 2017 nimons, usa Proof of Service of Su la citatión use el formulario Proof il NOTICE TO THE PERSON SEI	cumpte con las requisitos para grupos sin fines de lucro en e subforma, fiven sucone, agovi eclamar las cuotas y los costos acuardo o una concesión de licaso o caso o cas	obtener servicios legales gratufo i sitio web de California Legal Sar o poniendose en contacto con la prentias por imponer un gravama arbitraje en un caso de derecho con la contacto de l	as de un vivires. corte o el en sobre en sobre que de la della del
remision a abogados. Si no pued programa de servicios legales si novam laurie lipcalifornia org. en e colegio de abogados locales. Avicualquer recuperación de 310.00 pagar al gravaman de la cone un the name and address of the cell inombre y dirección de la colegio de 191 N. First Street. San Jihe name, address, and telepreti nombre, la dirección y el núclary. Kletters. Kletter Lavidate.	s recomendable que flame à un aboga le pagar a un aboga le contro de Ayuda de las Cortes de C. ISO. Por ley la corte tiene derecho a in 20 ó más de valor recibida mediante un tes de que la corte pueda desechar el court is inte es): mia, County of Santa Clara (iosc, CA 95113) none number of plaintiffs altorney, imero de teléfono del abogado del a 1900 S. Norfolk Street, Str. NOV 1 7 2017 nimons, usa Proof of Service of Su la citatión use el formulario Proof il NOTICE TO THE PERSON SEI	completion los requisitos para signipos sin fines de lucro e es albionna, (xww. sucone.ca gov) eclamar las cuotas y los costos o acuerdo o una concesión de locaso. or plaintiff without an attorn demandanta, o del demanda e. 350, San Mateo, CA Clerk, by (Secretario) mmons (form POS-070).) of Service of Summons (PORVED: You are served antiter the fictitious name of (specific participation) and control of the served antiter the fictitious name of (specific participation).	noblemer servicios legales gratufo i sitio web de California Legal Sar o poniendose en contacto con la prentios por imponer un gravama arbitraje en un caso de derecho con la contacto de	as de un vivires. corte o el en sobre en sobre que de la della del
remison a abogados. Si no pued programa de servicios legales si invivo lavirelipcalifornia org. en e colegio de abogados locales. Avicualquer recuperación de 310.00 pagar al gravamen de la cone un line name and address of the del inombre y dirección de la colegio mombre y dirección de la colegio la lavire con	s recomendable que flame à un aboga le pagar a un abogado es posible que la pagar a un abogado es posible que infines de lucro Puede encontrar estos d'Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de C. ISO Por ley la corte tiene derecho a ri 20 ó más de valor recibida mediante un tes de que la corte puede desechar el court is inte es): mia, County of Santa Clara (ISC, CA 95113) mone number of plaintiffs altorney, innero de teléfono del abogado del A-1900 S. Norfolk Street, Strata (ISC, CA 95113) mmons, usa Proof of Service of Sunta citatión usa el formulario Proof (ISC, CA 95113) monor que la contrata (ISC) a sa inclusiva de defeno (ISC) a sa inclusiva de defeno (ISC) a sa inclusiva de defeno (ISC) a contrata (ISC) a sa inclusiva de defeno (ISC) a contrata (completion les requisites para signipes sin fines de lucro en es simborna, (www.suconc.ca.gov) eclamar las cuotas y los costos nacuerdo o una concesión de la caso o una caso o una caso o la caso o una caso o un	noblemer servicios legales gratufo i sitio web de California Legal Sar o poniendose en contacto con la prentios por imponer un gravama arbitraje en un caso de derecho con la contacto de	s de un vives, corte o el en sobre en sobre en sobre el en e
remision a abogados. Si no pued programa de servicios legales si novam laurie lipcalifornia org. en e colegio de abogados locales. Avicualquer recuperación de 310.00 pagar al gravaman de la cone un the name and address of the cell inombre y dirección de la colegio de 191 N. First Street. San Jihe name, address, and telepreti nombre, la dirección y el núclary. Kletters. Kletter Lavidate.	s recomendable que flame à un aboga de pagar a un abogado es posible que infines de lucro Puede encontrar estos d'Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de C. (SC) Por ley la cone tiene derecho a ribo o mas de vaior recibida mediante un tes de que la corte puede desenhar et court is infene est.) Touri is infine contrator de la contrator de teléfono del abogado del A-1900 S. Norfolk Street. Streen est. NOV 1 7 2017 MOV 1 7 20	completion les requisites para signipes sin fines de lucro en es simborna, (www.suconc.ca.gov) eclamar las cuotas y los costos nacuerdo o una concesión de la caso o una caso o una caso o la caso o una caso o un	in obtener services legales gratuad in stillo web de California Legal Sar o poniendose en contacto con la prentias por imponer un gravama arbitraje en un caso de derecho crisco de la contacto de la con	s de un vives, corte o el en sobre en sobre en sobre el en e

EXHIBIT A

COPY

	•	ENDUGGED CW-010
of Care Carrett values (Attorner Annie State Parisa Cary Kletter (SBN 210230)	THE SEC GOOSES.	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Kletter Law 1900 S. Norfolk Street, Suite 350, San Matec		2017 NOT 17 AM H: 5"
телернове ко = 415,434,3400 аттория скля учени. Esmeralda Soto	FAY YC	The state of the s
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San	ita Clara	
STREET SOURCES 191 N. First Street		S Alvarez
MALING ADDRESS UPPANLIZE CODE San Jose 95113		S. Alvaio.
BRANCH NAME		
CASE NAME:	C'	
SOTO v. CHIPOTLE SERVICES, LI	C: et al.	COSE NUMBER
✓ Unlimited Limited		17CV3193
(Amount demanded is		arke.
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defer (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3,402)	
Items 1–6 belov	w must be completed (see instructions	
 Check one box below for the case type that I 		
Auto Tort Auto (22)	Contract Breach of contract/warranty (06)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrus/Trade regulation (03)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)
Asbestos (04) Product hability (24)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Medical malpractice (45)	Real Property Eminent domain/Inverse	Environmental/Toxic lort (30)
Other PI/PO/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)
Buşiness tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)	Unlawful Detainer Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Other non-PI/PD/WD (ort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment Wrongful termination (36)	Petition re: arbitration award (11) Virit of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
2. This case is/ is not completed factors requiring exceptional judicial manage		Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
a. Large number of separately represe	·	er of witnesses
b Extensive motion practice raising di		with related actions pending in one or more count
issues that will be time-consuming t	F)	nties, states, or countries, or in a federal count
c Substantial amount of documentary		postjudgment judicial supervision
Remedies sought (check all that apply): a	√ monetary b √ nonmonetary.	declaratory or injunctive reliefc punitive
1. Number of causes of action (specify). 14		
5. This case is is is not a class 5. If there are any known related cases, file and		may use form CM-015/
	b serve a notice of related case. (700	may adopting our organization
Date: November 16, 2017 Darv Kletter	•	Ring
TABE DE ENTRY KAMER		SIGN-TUPE OF PARTY OF ANIORIE (FICE PARTY)
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the firmunder the Probate Code, Family Code, or Win sanctions.	NOTICE st paper filed in the action or proceedi lelfare and institutions Code). (Cal. Ru	ing (except small claims cases or cases filed ules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
. File this cover sheet in addition to any cover	sheet required by local court rule. eq. of the California Rules of Court, yo	ou must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
other parties to the action or proceeding. • Unless this is a collections case under rule 3	3.740 or a complex case, this cover sh	neet will be used for statistical purposes only.

EXHIBIT A

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1. check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party. its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court,

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following. (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3,400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiffs designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

```
Auto Tort
```

Auto (22)-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury) Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

Asbestos (04)

Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death

Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24) Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice-

Physicians & Surgeons

Other Professional Health Care Malpractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PDWD

(e.g., assault, vandalism) Intentional Infliction of

Emotional Distress Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress

Other PI/PDAMD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business Practice (07)

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

(alse arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25) Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice (nat medical or legal) Other Nnn-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

Contract Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer

or wrongful eviction)
Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller

Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract/ Warranty

Other Breach of Contract/Warranty

Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09)

Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff Other Promissory Note/Collections

Case Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation

Other Coverage

Other Contract (37)

Contractual Fraud Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26) Writ of Possession of Real Property

Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure)

Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11) .
Writ of Mandate (02)
Writ-Administrative Mandamus Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)
Review of Health Officer Order

Notice of Appeal-Labor

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal.

Rules of Court Rules 3.400–3.403)
Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)
Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)
Securities Litigation (28)
Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims (arising from provisionally complex

case type listed above) (41) Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20)
Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)

Confession of Judgment (non-

domestic relations)

Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

RICO (27)
Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment)

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint

Case (non-tort/non-complex)
Other Civil Complaint

(non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition Parinership and Corporate

Governance (21) Other Petition (not specified

above) (43)

Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse

Election Contest Petition for Name Change

Petition for Relief From Late

Other Civil Petition

Page 2 of 2

OM-019 (Rev. July 1: 2007)

Commissioner Appeals CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET